



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/677,454	10/02/2000	Donald W. Schmidt	POU920000173US1	5119

7590

03/15/2004

Floyd A. Gonzalez
IBM Corporation
2455 South Road P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER

PERVEEN, REHANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2182

5

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/677,454

Applicant(s)

SCHMIDT ET AL.

Examiner

Rehana Perveen

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 9-11 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8, 12-16 and 20-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loughran et al, Patent No. 6,570,848, in view of Gioquindo et al, Patent No. 6,654,812.

As to claim 1, Loughran et al teach registering a send queue in a lookup table, registering a receive queue in the lookup table, and executing a send from a source which interrogates the lookup table to locate the send queue and the receive queue and send the data in the send queue to the receive queue of a destination (col. 3 lines 5-53).

Gioquindo et al teach a data processing system having multiple logical partitions and communication between partitions using a lookup table (abstract, col. 2 lines 41-50, and col. 5 lines 44-60).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Loughran et al and Gioquindo et al because

Art Unit: 2182

utilizing Loughran et al's data transfer method into Gioquindo et al's inter-partition communication would have enabled more efficient flow control for prior existing partition to partition data transfer system.

As to claim 2, it is noted that neither Loughran et al nor Gioquindo et al expressly teach the send queue and the receive queue are established in accordance with QDIO architecture. However, it has been quite well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, the benefits and advantages of using the QDIO architecture, thus making it obvious to utilize such prior art architecture.

As to claim 3, Loughran et al teach the lookup table is stored in a hardware storage area of a data processing system (col. 3 lines 5-53).

Claims 9-11 and 17-19 are directed to the system implementing the method of claims 1-3. Loughran et al and Gioquindo et al, in combination, teach the method as set forth in claims 1-3. Therefore, Loughran et al and Gioquindo et al, in combination, also teach the system as set forth in claims 9-11 and 17-19.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-8, 12-16, and 20-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2182

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rehana Perveen whose telephone number is 703-305-8476. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey C Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Rehana Perveen
Primary Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100